

REMARKS

Claims 11-28 are pending in this application. Attached hereto is a complete listing of all claims in the application, with their current status listed parenthetically. By this Response, no claims are amended, cancelled or withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner maintains her prior rejection of claims 11-28 as being anticipated by Webster and disagrees with Applicant's argument that Webster does not teach "**an** ultra-wideband communication **device** comprising **a first transceiver** structured to communicate at a first data rate and **a second transceiver** structured to communicate at a second data rate" as recited in Applicant's independent claims 11, 16 and 23 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully traverses this maintained rejection.

To support her rejection, the Examiner states in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, that the "above claimed limitation is taught in Webster by mixed signal devices (elements 103, 105) communicating at different or higher data rates than the standard 802.11b rates communicated between mixed signal devices (elements 107, 109)."

Elements 103, 105, 107 and 109 are illustrated in FIG. 1 which is described as "'a block diagram of a WLAN system including **four devices** operating within the same room or area, where two of the devices are implemented according to the 802.11b standard and the other two are implemented according to the 802.11g proposal" [col. 4, lines 11-15] (emphasis added).

Webster then teaches: "FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a wireless local area network (WLAN) system 100 operating within a particular room or area 101, including **four WLAN devices 103, 105, 107 and 109**" [col. 5, lines 49-52] (emphasis added).

A review of FIG. 1 shows four boxes: 103 (labeled "Device (High Rate)"); 105 (labeled "Device (High Rate)"); 107 (labeled "Device (802.11b)"); and 109 (labeled "Device (802.11b)").

Thus, Webster teaches communication between four **separate and distinct radios**, 103, 105, 107 and 109. Each radio comprises "**a transmitter** configured to transmit according to a mixed waveform configuration and **a receiver** configured to acquire and receive packets with a mixed waveform configuration" (col. 2, lines 46-49) [emphasis added]. Webster's FIG. 16 illustrates a block diagram of a transmitter that shows various components of **the single transmitter**. Webster contains no teaching or suggestion of **one device that contains two transceivers**, with each transceiver structured to communicate at a different data rate, as recited in Applicant's claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Webster cannot anticipate originally-filed claim 11, nor Applicant's previously amended independent claims 16 and 23.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 11, 16 and 23.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above response has traversed the rejection of independent claims 11, 16 and 23. Claims 12-15, 17-22 and 24-27 depend from claims 11, 16 and 23, respectively, and accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 12-15, 17-22 and 24-27 has been traversed by virtue of their dependency from claims 11, 16 and 23. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 28 stands rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Webster. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 28 depends from independent claim 23, and accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 28 has been traversed by virtue of its dependency from claim 23. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that this Response has addressed all items in the Office Action and now places the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-28 at an early date is solicited. Enclosed with this Response is a Request for Continued Examination, and fee. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee required to our Deposit Account No. 50-3143, in the name of Pulse-Link, Inc. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter R. Martinez
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,845

December 7, 2005
Date

c/o PULSE-LINK, INC.
1969 Kellogg Avenue
Carlsbad, California 92008
Telephone No.: (760) 607-0844